arXiv:1411.0269v1 [math.AP] 2 Nov 2014

Pattern formation in parabolic equations containing hysteresis with diffusive thresholds

Pavel Gurevich*, Dmitrii Rachinskii†

November 4, 2014

Abstract

We consider a reaction-diffusion system with discontinuous reaction terms modeled by non-ideal relays. The system is motivated by an epigenetic population model of evolution of two-phenotype bacteria which switch phenotype in response to variations of environment. We prove the formation of patterns in the phenotype space. The mechanism responsible for pattern formation is based on memory (hysteresis) of the non-ideal relays.

1 Introduction

Bi-stability is common in living systems. Max Delbrück was the first to associate different stable stationary states with different phenotypes, or epigenetic differences, in clonal populations such as those arising in the process of cell differentiation [10]. Starting from early experimental work of Novick and Wiener on *lac-operon* in *E. coli*, it has been believed that bi-stability can help organisms gain fitness in varying environmental conditions if the organism can switch phenotype following the environmental change. *Lac-operon* is a collection of genes associated with transport and metabolism of lactose in the bacterium. Expression of these genes can be turned on by molecules that have been called inducers. Novick and Weiner [31] as well as Cohn and Horibata [6, 7, 8], relying on prior work of others [30, 3, 35], demonstrated that two phenotypes each associated with "on" and "off" state of *lac-operon* expression can be obtained from the same culture of genetically identical bacteria. The fraction of each corresponding sub-population depended on the history of exposure to the inducer. As illustrated in Fig. 1.1, the *lac-operon* state was induced (switched on) when the extracellular inducer concentration (input) exceeded an upper threshold. The operon was switched off when the inducer concentration fell below the lower threshold. Both phenotypes

*Free University Berlin, Germany & Peoples' Friendship University of Russia, Russia; email: gurevichp@gmail.com

†Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Texas at Dallas, USA & Department of Applied Mathematics, University College Cork, Ireland; email: dmitry.rachinskiy@utdallas.edu



Figure 1.1: Bi-stable switch (non-ideal relay).

remain stable through multiple generations of the bacterial culture after the extracellular concentration of the inducer is reduced to lower levels. Novick and Weiner did not use the term "bi-stable switch" (non-ideal relay [28]) to describe their observations, but effectively that is what it was. Difference in the reproductive rates of different phenotypes in different environments was also noted in their work suggesting association of phenotype bi-stability and switching with strategies for increasing population growth in varying environments.

These early findings on the bi-stability of the *lac-operon* were consistent with earlier findings on stability of enzymes in yeast [40]. Recent experiments using molecular biology methods (such as those incorporating green fluorescent protein expression under the *lac-operon* promoter) permitted to confirm and further study the region of bi-stability of the *lac-operon* even when multiple input variables (TMG that acts as the inducer and glucose, for example) were used [32]. Furthermore, multi-stable gene expression and phenotype switching in varying environmental conditions have been well documented in many natural and artificially constructed biological systems [39, 27, 17, 37, 42, 34, 29, 20, 13, 16, 33]. These experiments were complemented by a substantial body of theoretical work that demonstrated that organisms can gain fitness by adjusting the rate of switching between phenotypes, or switching thresholds, to the law of environmental variations. A typical setting for the analytical work has been an optimization problem where fitness (measured, for example, by the average growth rate of the population) is the utility function, each phenotype is optimal for a certain state of environment, and there is a cost associated with changing phenotype. This setting has been applied to models based on differential equations of population growth, switching systems and game theory [26, 41, 43]. One well documented experimental fact, which can translate into the cost of phenotype switching, is the so-called lag phase that delays reproduction in an organism undergoing a switch. For example, in a simple (stochastic) differential equation model incorporating the lag phase, which was proposed in [14], the growth rate is maximized by a bi-stability range of a certain size that depends on the parameters of the environmental input. Another related idea that has been explored in a similar modeling context is bet-hedging, that is a strategy promoting diversification whereby co-existence of several phenotypes, including those less fit to the current environmental conditions, can favor growth in varying environments [36].

The bi-stable switch (also known as the non-ideal relay) is the simplest model of a bi-stable system. In particular, the differential model of phenotype switching proposed in [14] reduces to the non-ideal relay in the limit of fast switching. In the present work, we are interested in the evolutionary process in a colony of two-phenotype bacteria where the competition for a resource (nutrients in this case) acts as a selection pressure. Motivated

by the fact that different bi-stability ranges are optimal (ensure the fastest growth rate) for different laws of variation of nutrients concentration, we model bacteria by non-ideal relays, which have all possible bi-stability ranges from a certain interval. Moreover, we allow a diffusion process over the interval of admissible bi-stability ranges. We assume that each bacterium can sporadically change its switching threshold in response to noise in the environment or some internal processes; also, a bacterium produces offsprings with different thresholds. Further, these random changes of the threshold are assumed to occur according to the Gaussian distribution. Hence, diffusion imitates random variations of the bi-stability range that diversify switching thresholds in bacteria. In sum, the evolution is defined by two factors: competition and diffusive (random) changes of the bi-stability range. The resulting model describes dynamics of populations by a reaction-diffusion system with non-ideal relays continuously distributed over an interval of bi-stability ranges; the system also includes integral terms in the equations for nutrients, describing the influence of bacteria on the environment.

The well-posedness of this model was proved in [18]. It was also shown that each solution converges to a steady state distribution (due to the diffusion, the concentration of bacteria distributes uniformly over all the interval of admissible bi-stability ranges). The model naturally admits a continual set of steady state solutions as there is a continuum of bi-stable elements. Moreover, a numerical evidence was given that in case of slow diffusion solutions converge to steady states that can be naturally interpreted as patterns in the phenotype space.

Differential equations with non-ideal relays have been previously used to model reaction and diffusion processes in spatially distributed colonies of bacteria [21, 22, 38, 19]. In contrast to our setting, all relays in these models have been assumed identical (that is, having the same bi-stability range), while spatial patterns appeared, in particular, due to the spatial diffusion of environmental substances.

The mechanism of pattern formation in the phenotype space discussed in the present paper is different. The objective of this work is to rigorously prove that, in our setting, the patterns are created by the combined action of the slow diffusion and the switching process. Furthermore, the proof allows us to determine the time scale of pattern formation and some of the pattern parameters. Our results show that there is no single winner in the evolutionary game of the two competing phenotypes, but rather both phenotypes are present in the limit distribution of bacteria over the interval of available threshold values. This supports the idea that the bet-hedging strategy can be optimal for increasing fitness. It is shown that the complexity of the pattern in the limit distribution increases with decreasing diffusion rate in agreement with the numerical results presented in [14, 18]. Further, we show that a steady state solution achieved in the long time limit depends on the initial state. This effect can be interpreted as a manifestation of the long term memory on the level of populations and agrees with earlier findings suggesting that memory in the switching strategy of individual bacteria can grant fitness in varying environments [15]. Our results suggest that the attractor of the system is a connected continual set of stationary patterns.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the model: a system of

reaction-diffusion equations with spatially distributed relays, and recall the well-posedness property from [18]. In Section 3, we formulate our main results: pattern formation on two different time scales, depending on the initial data. In Section 4, we establish some properties of solutions of the heat equation with initial data close to the delta function. These properties play an essential role in Sections 5 and 6, where we prove the two main results about pattern formation.

2 Model description

2.1 Model assumptions

In this paper, we consider a class of models, which attempt to account for a number of phenomena listed above, namely (a) switching of bacteria between two phenotypes (states) in response to variations of environmental conditions; (b) hysteretic switching strategy (switching rules) associated with bi-stability of phenotype states; (c) heterogeneity of the population in the form of a distribution of switching thresholds; (d) bet-hedging in the form of diffusion between subpopulations characterized by different bi-stability ranges; and, (e) competition for nutrients. The resulting model is a reaction-diffusion system including, as reaction terms, discontinuous hysteresis relay operators and the integral of those. This integral can be interpreted as the Preisach operator [28] with a time dependent density (the density is a component of the solution describing the varying distribution of bacteria). The main objective of this paper is to prove that fitness, competition and diffusion can act together to select a nontrivial distribution of phenotypes (states) over the population of thresholds.

We assume that each of the two phenotypes, denoted by 1 and -1, consumes a different type of nutrient (for example, one consumes lactose and the other glucose). The amount of nutrient available for phenotype i at the moment t is denoted by $f_i(t)$ where $i = \pm 1$. The model is based on the following assumptions (see [18] for further discussion).

1. Each bacterium changes phenotype in response to the variations of the variable $w = f_1/(f_1 + f_{-1}) - 1/2$, which measures the deviation of the relative concentration of the first nutrient from the value $1/2$ in the mixture of the two nutrients.

2. The input $w = w(t)$ is mapped to the (binary) phenotype (state) of a bacterium $r(t) = \mathcal{R}^x(w)(t)$, where $\mathcal{R}^x$ is the non-ideal relay operator with symmetric switching thresholds x, $y = -x$ with $x > 0$; see Fig. 1.1 and the rigorous definition (2.2) in Section 2.2.

3. The population includes bacteria with different bi-stability ranges $(-x, x)$, where the threshold value x varies over an interval $[\underline{x}, \overline{x}] \subset (0, 1/2)$. We will denote by $u(x, t)$ the density of the biomass of bacteria with given switching thresholds $\pm x$ at a moment t.

4. There is a diffusion process acting on the density u.

5. At any particular time moment t, for any given x, all the bacteria with the switching threshold values $\pm x$ are in the same state (phenotype). That is, $u(x,t)$ is the total density of bacteria with the threshold x at the moment t and they are all in the same state. This means that when a bacterium with a threshold x' sporadically changes its threshold to a different value x, it simultaneously copies the state from other bacteria which have the threshold x. In particular, this may require a bacterium to change the state when its threshold changes.

With these assumptions, we obtain the following model of the evolution of bacteria and nutrients,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = Du_{xx} + \dfrac{1}{2}(1+\mathcal{R}^x(w))\,uf_1 + \dfrac{1}{2}(1-\mathcal{R}^x(w))\,uf_{-1}, \\ \dot f_1 = -\dfrac{1}{2}f_1\displaystyle\int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}}(1+\mathcal{R}^x(w))\,u\,dx, \\ \dot f_{-1} = -\dfrac{1}{2}f_{-1}\displaystyle\int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}}(1-\mathcal{R}^x(w))\,u\,dx, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where u_t and u_{xx} are the derivatives of the population density u; $D>0$ is the diffusion coefficient; dot denotes the derivative with respect to time; and all the non-ideal relays $\mathcal{R}^x$, $x\in[\underline{x},\overline{x}]$, have the same input $w=f_1/(f_1+f_{-1})-1/2$. We additionally assume the growth rate $\frac{1}{2}(1+i\mathcal{R}^x(w))\,uf_i$ based on the mass action law for bacteria in the phenotype $i=\pm1$. The rate of the consumption of nutrient in the equation for $f_i=f_i(t)$ is proportional to the total biomass of bacteria in the phenotype i, hence the integral; $\underline{x}$ and $\overline{x}$ are the lower and upper bounds on available threshold values, respectively.

We assume that a certain amount of nutrients is available at the initial moment; the nutrients are not supplied after that moment. We assume the Neumann boundary conditions for u, that is no flux of the population density u through the lower and upper bounds of available threshold values.

2.2 Rigorous model setting

Throughout the paper, we assume that $x\in[\underline{x},\overline{x}]\subset(0,1/2)$.

We begin with a rigorous definition of the hysteresis operator $\mathcal{R}^x$ (*non-ideal relay*) with fixed thresholds $\pm x$. This operator takes a continuous function $w=w(t)$ defined on an interval $t\in[0,T)$ to the binary function $r=\mathcal{R}^x(w)$ of time defined on the same interval, which is given by

$$\mathcal{R}^x(w)(t)=\begin{cases} -1 & \text{if} \quad w(\tau)\le -x \text{ for some } \tau\in[0,t] \\ & \quad\ \text{and } w(s)<x \text{ for all } s\in[\tau,t], \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad w(\tau)\ge x \text{ for some } \tau\in[0,t] \\ & \quad\ \text{and } w(s)>-x \text{ for all } s\in[\tau,t], \\ r_0 & \text{if} \quad -x<w(\tau)<x \text{ for all } \tau\in[0,t], \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

where r_0 is either 1 or -1 (initial state of the non-ideal relay $\mathcal{R}^x$). Since r_0 may take different values for different x, we write $r_0=r_0(x)$. The function $r_0=r_0(x)$ of $x\in[\underline{x},\overline{x}]$ taking values

± 1 is called the *initial configuration* of the non-ideal relays. In what follows, we do not explicitly indicate the dependence of the operator $\mathcal{R}^x$ on $r_0(x)$.

In this paper, we assume that $r_0(x)$ is *simple*, which means the following. There is a partition $\underline{x} = \bar{x}_0 < \bar{x}_1 < \cdots < \bar{x}_{N_0} = \overline{x}$ of the interval $[\underline{x}, \overline{x}]$ such that the function $r_0(x)$, which satisfies $|r_0(x)| = 1$ for all $\underline{x} \le x \le \overline{x}$, is constant on each interval $(\bar{x}_{k-1}, \bar{x}_k]$ and has different signs on any two adjacent intervals:

$$\begin{aligned} &r_0(x) = r_0(\bar{x}_k), \qquad x \in (\bar{x}_{k-1}, \bar{x}_k],\ k = 1, \dots, N_0, \\ &r_0(\bar{x}_{k-1}) r_0(\bar{x}_k) = -1,\ k = 2, \dots, N_0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where the second relation holds if $N_0 \ge 2$.

We define the *distributed relay operator* $\mathcal{R}(w)$ taking functions $w = w(t)$ to functions $r = r(x,t)$ by

$$r(x,t) = \mathcal{R}(w)(x,t) := \mathcal{R}^x(w)(t).$$

The function $r(\cdot, t)$ will be referred to as the configuration (state) of the distributed relay operator at the moment t.

We set

$$\underline{U}(t) = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} u(x,t)\, dx, \quad \mathcal{P}(u,w)(t) = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} u(x,t) \mathcal{R}^x(w)(t)\, dx. \tag{2.4}$$

Here the first integral is the total mass of bacteria and $\mathcal{P}$ is the so-called *Preisach operator* [28] with the time dependent density function u; differential equations with the Preisach operator have been studied, for example, in [5, 43, 2, 9, 4, 12, 11, 25, 24, 23]. Further, we replace the unknown functions f_1 and f_{-1} in system (2.1) by $v = f_1 + f_{-1}$ (total mass of the two nutrients) and $w = f_1/(f_1 + f_{-1}) - 1/2$ (deviation of the relative concentration of the first nutrient from the value $1/2$). The resulting system takes the form

$$\begin{cases} u_t = D u_{xx} + \left(\dfrac{1}{2} + w \mathcal{R}(w) \right) uv, \\ \dot{v} = -\left(\dfrac{\underline{U}}{2} + w \mathcal{P}(u,w) \right) v, \\ \dot{w} = -\left(\dfrac{1}{2} + w \right) \left(\dfrac{1}{2} - w \right) \mathcal{P}(u,w), \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

where we assume the Neumann boundary conditions

$$u_x|_{x=\underline{x}} = u_x|_{x=\overline{x}} = 0 \tag{2.6}$$

and the initial conditions

$$\begin{aligned} &u(x,0) = u_0(x), \quad v(0) = v_0, \quad w(0) = w_0, \quad r(x,0) = r_0(x), \\ &u_0(x) \ge 0, \quad \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} u_0(x)\, dx = 1, \quad v_0 \ge 0, \quad |w_0| \le \overline{x}, \quad r_0(x) \text{ is simple.} \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

2.3 Well-posedness

The problem (2.5)–(2.7), which contains a discontinuous distributed relay operator, was shown in [18] to be well posed. We briefly summarize this result before proceeding with the analysis of long time behavior.

Set $Q_T = (\underline{x}, \overline{x}) \times (0, T)$ for $T > 0$. We will use the standard Lebesgue spaces $L_2(Q_T)$ and $L_2 = L_2(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$; the Sobolev spaces $W_2^k = W_2^k(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$; the anisotropic Sobolev space $W_2^{2,1}(Q_T)$ with the norm

$$\|u\|_{W_2^{2,1}(Q_T)} = \left(\int_0^T \|u(\cdot, t)\|_{W_2^2}^2 \, dt + \int_0^T \|u_t(\cdot, t)\|_{L_2}^2 \, dt \right)^{1/2};$$

and, the space

$$\mathcal{W}(Q_T) = W_2^{2,1}(Q_T) \times C^1[0, T] \times C^1[0, T].$$

Definition 2.1. Assume that $(u_0, v_0, w_0) \in W_2^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$. We say that (u, v, w) is a (*global*) *solution* of problem (2.5)–(2.7) if, for any $T > 0$, $(u, v, w) \in \mathcal{W}(Q_T)$, $r(\cdot, t)$ is a continuous L_2-valued function for $t \geq 0$, and relations (2.5)–(2.7) hold in the corresponding function spaces.

The following result was proved in [18].

Theorem 2.1. *If $(u_0, v_0, w_0) \in W_2^1 \times \mathbb{R}^2$, then*

1. *problem (2.5)–(2.7) has a unique solution (u, v, w);*
2. *the state $r(\cdot, t) = \mathcal{R}(w)(\cdot, t)$ of the distributed relay operator is simple for all $t \geq 0$;*
3. *we have*

$$\underline{U}(t) \geq 0, \quad \underline{U}(t) \to 1 + v_0, \quad 0 \leq u(\cdot, t) \to \frac{1 + v_0}{\overline{x} - \underline{x}} \quad \text{in} \quad C[\underline{x}, \overline{x}], \tag{2.8}$$

$$\dot{v}(t) \leq 0, \qquad v(t) \leq v_0 e^{-\mu t} \quad \text{with} \quad \mu = 1/2 - \overline{x} > 0, \tag{2.9}$$

$$|w(t)| \leq \overline{x} < 1/2, \tag{2.10}$$

where the convergence takes place as $t \to \infty$.

The behavior given by (2.8)–(2.10) is to be expected. Indeed, as we assume no supply of nutrients after the initial moment, the total amount of nutrients $v(t)$ converges to zero. When the density of nutrients vanishes as a result of consumption by bacteria, the equation for the density u approaches the homogeneous heat equation with zero flux boundary conditions, which explains why the density of bacteria $u(x, t)$ converges to a uniform distribution over the interval $[\underline{x}, \overline{x}]$ as a result of the diffusion.

3 Main results

The main observation we make in this paper is that for some initial data (2.7), the limit distribution $r_*(x)$ has many sign changes provided that the rate D of the diffusion process is small enough. In particular, if $r_0(x) \equiv 1$ or $r_0(x) \equiv -1$, we interpret the transition of system (2.5) from a uniform state $r_0(x)$ to the sign changing state $r_*(x)$ as the formation of a pattern in the distribution of phenotypes over the set of thresholds in bacteria.

Below, we consider the initial density satisfying the additional relation

$$u_0(x) \le \varepsilon, \quad x \in (\underline{x}, \overline{x} - \varepsilon) \tag{3.1}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

Theorem 3.1. *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v_0 \ge 0$, there exist $D_* = D_*(N, v_0) > 0$, $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(N, v_0) > 0$, and sequences $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ such that*

$$0 < \tau_N < \tau_{N-1} < \cdots < \tau_2 < \tau_1,$$
$$\underline{x} < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_N < \overline{x},$$

and the following is true. If $D \in (0, D_*)$ and $u_0(x)$ satisfies (3.1) with $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_*)$, then the state function $r(\cdot, t)$ of the distributed relay operator has at least $N - i + 1$ sign changes for $x \in [x_i, \overline{x})$ and for all $t \ge \tau_i / D$.

Rephrasing the statement of this theorem, if the initial density $u_0(x)$ of bacteria approaches the delta function $\delta(x - \overline{x})$ and the diffusion D goes to zero, then the number of sign changes of the limit distribution $r_*(x)$ tends to infinity.

Theorem 3.1 establishes the pattern formation on the time scale of order D^{-1}. Under the additional assumption that the amount of nutrients in the system is small, we show that the pattern is formed on the time scale of order 1.

Theorem 3.2. *There exist sequences $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ and $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ satisfying*

$$0 < t_1 < t_2 < \ldots, \qquad 0 < y_1 < y_2 < \ldots$$

such that, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there are $D_* = D_*(N) > 0$ and $v_* = v_*(N) > 0$ with the following property. For any $D \in (0, D_*)$, one can find $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(D) > 0$ such that if $u_0(x)$ satisfies (3.1) with $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_*)$ and $v_0 \in [0, v_*)$, then the state function $r(\cdot, t)$ of the distributed relay operator has at least i sign changes for $x \in [x_i, \overline{x})$ and for all $t \ge t_i$, where $x_i = \overline{x} - D^{1/2} y_i$ and $i = 1, \ldots, N$.

4 Fundamental solutions of the heat equation

4.1 Setting of auxiliary problems for the heat equation

In this section, we prove some auxiliary results that allow us to compare solutions of the heat equation on finite intervals with the fundamental solution on the infinite interval. We

will use two time scales given by the variable t for systems with arbitrary diffusion D and by the variable τ for systems with diffusion equal to 1. Later, we will relate these time scales via $\tau = Dt$.

Problem 1:

$$\begin{cases} \psi_\tau = \psi_{xx}, \quad x \in (-\infty, \overline{x}),\ \tau > 0, \\ \psi_x|_{x=\overline{x}} = 0, \quad \psi|_{\tau=0} = \delta(x - \overline{x}), \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Dirac delta function. Its (*fundamental*) solution is well known to be given by

$$\psi(x, \tau) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\tau}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\overline{x} - x)^2}{4\tau}\right). \tag{4.2}$$

Problem 2:

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_\tau = \varphi_{xx}, \quad x \in (\underline{x}, \overline{x}),\ \tau > 0, \\ \varphi_x|_{x=\overline{x}} = \varphi_x|_{x=\underline{x}} = 0, \quad \varphi|_{\tau=0} = \delta(x - \overline{x}). \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

Formally solving this problem by the Fourier method, we obtain the solution

$$\varphi(x, \tau) = \frac{1}{\overline{x} - \underline{x}} + \frac{2}{\overline{x} - \underline{x}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\left(\frac{n\pi}{\overline{x} - \underline{x}}\right)^2 \tau\right) \cos\left(\frac{n\pi(\overline{x} - x)}{\overline{x} - \underline{x}}\right), \tag{4.4}$$

which we refer to as the *fundamental solution of problem* (4.3). Obviously, for any $\hat{\tau} > 0$, the series converges uniformly in the region

$$\{(x, \tau) : x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x}],\ \tau \geq \hat{\tau}\} \tag{4.5}$$

and defines there a bounded infinitely differentiable function $\varphi(x, \tau)$, which satisfies the heat equation and the Neumann boundary conditions in the classical sense. Using Lemma 4.1 below, one can easily see that the initial condition $\varphi|_{\tau=0} = \delta(x - \overline{x})$ is satisfied in the following sense: for any $g \in C[\underline{x}, \overline{x}]$,

$$\int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} \varphi(x, \tau) g(x)\, dx \to g(\overline{x}) \quad \text{as } \tau \to 0.$$

Problem 3:

$$\begin{cases} \omega_t = D\omega_{xx}, \quad x \in (\underline{x}, \overline{x}),\ t > t_0, \\ \omega_x|_{x=\overline{x}} = \omega_x|_{x=\underline{x}} = 0, \quad \omega|_{t=t_0} = \omega_0(x), \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

where $t_0 \geq 0$ and $\omega_0 \in W_2^1(\underline{x}, \overline{x})$. Set

$$\Omega_0 = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} \omega_0(x)\, dx.$$

We assume that

$$0 \leq \frac{\omega_0(x)}{\Omega_0} \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x} - \delta_0], \tag{4.7}$$

for some $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0 > 0$. Using the Fourier method, we represent the solution of problem (4.6) as the series

$$\omega(x,t;\varepsilon_0,\delta_0,D,t_0) = \frac{\Omega_0}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}} + \frac{2}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n \exp\left(-\left(\frac{n\pi}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)^2 D(t-t_0)\right)\cos\left(\frac{n\pi(\overline{x}-x)}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right) \tag{4.8}$$

with the coefficients

$$A_n = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} \omega_0(x)\cos\left(\frac{n\pi(\overline{x}-x)}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)\,dx. \tag{4.9}$$

We explicitly indicate the dependence of ω on the parameters $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0, D, t_0$. We will see later on, in Lemma 4.2, that these parameters (rather than the explicit form of the initial data $\omega_0(x)$) determine the closeness between ω in Problem 3 and φ in Problem 2.

Note that the series in (4.8) converges in $W_2^{2,1}((\underline{x},\overline{x})\times(t_0,T))$ and hence in $C([\underline{x},\overline{x}]\times[t_0,T])$ for any $T > t_0$. It also converges uniformly in the region (4.5) and defines there a bounded function $\omega(x,t;D,t_0)$ that is infinitely differentiable with respect to (x,t).

4.2 Comparing Problems 1, 2, and 3

First we compare Problems 1 and 2.

Lemma 4.1. *For any $\theta > 0$,*

$$\|\varphi(\cdot,\tau) - \psi(\cdot,\tau)\|_{C[\underline{x},\overline{x}]} \le c(\theta)\exp\left(-\frac{(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^2}{5\tau}\right), \quad \tau \in (0,\theta], \tag{4.10}$$

where $c(\theta) > 0$ does not depend on $\tau \in (0,\theta]$.

Proof. Let us expand $\psi(x,\tau)$ given by (4.2) into the Fourier series

$$\psi(x,\tau) = \frac{1}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\psi_n(\tau)\cos\left(\frac{n\pi(\overline{x}-x)}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right) \tag{4.11}$$

on the interval $\underline{x} \le x \le \overline{x}$. Here

$$\psi_0(\tau) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi\tau}}\int_0^{\overline{x}-\underline{x}} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{4\tau}\right)\,dx = 1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_{\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2\sqrt{\tau}}}^{\infty}\exp\left(-x^2\right)\,dx = 1 - o\left(\exp\left(-\frac{(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^2}{4\tau}\right)\right), \tag{4.12}$$

where $o(\cdot)$ is taken as $\tau \to 0$, and, for $n = 1, 2\ldots,$

$$\psi_n(\tau) = \frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int_0^{\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2\sqrt{\tau}}}\exp\left(-x^2\right)\cos\left(\frac{2n\pi x\sqrt{\tau}}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)\,dx. \tag{4.13}$$

It follows from the identity

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int\limits_{-\infty}^{\infty}\exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right)\exp\left(i\xi x\right)\,dx=\exp\left(-\frac{\xi^2}{2}\right)$$

that

$$\frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int\limits_{0}^{\infty}\exp\left(-x^2\right)\cos\left(\frac{2n\pi x\sqrt{\tau}}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)\,dx=2\exp\left(-\left(\frac{n\pi}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)^2\tau\right). \tag{4.14}$$

Further, using integration by parts and the estimate $\int\limits_{y}^{\infty}(1-2x^2)\exp\left(-x^2\right)\,dx=O\left(y\,\exp\left(-y^2\right)\right)$ as $y\to\infty$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4}{\sqrt{\pi}}\int\limits_{\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2\sqrt{\tau}}}^{\infty}\exp\left(-x^2\right)\cos\left(\frac{2n\pi x\sqrt{\tau}}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)\,dx&=\frac{4(\overline{x}-\underline{x})}{\pi^{3/2}n\sqrt{\tau}}\int\limits_{\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2\sqrt{\tau}}}^{\infty}x\exp\left(-x^2\right)\sin\left(\frac{2n\pi x\sqrt{\tau}}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)\,dx\\&=\frac{2(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^2}{\pi^{5/2}n^2\tau}\left(\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2\sqrt{\tau}}\exp\left(-\frac{(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^2}{4\tau}\right)\cos(n\pi)+\int\limits_{\frac{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}{2\sqrt{\tau}}}^{\infty}(1-2x^2)\exp\left(-x^2\right)\cos\left(\frac{2n\pi x\sqrt{\tau}}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)\,dx\right)\\&=\frac{1}{n^2\tau^{3/2}}O\left(\exp\left(-\frac{(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^2}{4\tau}\right)\right),\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

where $O(\cdot)$ is taken as $\tau\to 0$ and does not depend on n. Relations (4.13)–(4.15) imply

$$\psi_n(\tau)=2\exp\left(-\left(\frac{n\pi}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)^2\tau\right)-\frac{1}{n^2}\,O\left(\exp\left(-\frac{(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^2}{5\tau}\right)\right).$$

Combining this formula with (4.4), (4.11), and (4.12), we conclude that

$$|\varphi(x,\tau)-\psi(x,\tau)|=o\left(\exp\left(-\frac{(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^2}{4\tau}\right)\right)+O\left(\exp\left(-\frac{(\overline{x}-\underline{x})^2}{5\tau}\right)\right)\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^2}.$$

□

Now we compare Problems 2 and 3.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that* (4.7) *holds with* $\varepsilon_0\le 1$. *Then, for all* $t>t_0$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\frac{\omega(\cdot,t;\varepsilon_0,\delta_0,D,t_0)}{\Omega_0}-\varphi(\cdot,D(t-t_0))\right\|_{C[\underline{x},\overline{x}]}\\&\qquad\le C\left(\delta_0^2(D(t-t_0))^{-3/2}+\varepsilon_0(D(t-t_0))^{-1/2}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

where $C>0$ *does not depend on* $t,\varepsilon_0,\delta_0,D,t_0$.

Proof. Using (4.7), one can easily see that the coefficients A_n given by (4.9) satisfy

$$\left|\frac{A_n}{\Omega_0} - 1\right| \le k_1(n^2\delta_0^2 + \varepsilon_0),$$

where $k_1 > 0$ does not depend on $n, \varepsilon_0, \delta_0$. Therefore,[1]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|\frac{\omega(\cdot,t;\varepsilon_0,\delta_0,D,t_0)}{\Omega_0} - \varphi(\cdot, D(t-t_0))\right\|_{C[\underline{x},\overline{x}]} \\
&\quad\le k_1\left(\delta_0^2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2\exp\left(-\left(\frac{n\pi}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)^2 D(t-t_0)\right) + \varepsilon_0\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\exp\left(-\left(\frac{n\pi}{\overline{x}-\underline{x}}\right)^2 D(t-t_0)\right)\right) \\
&\quad\le k_2\left(\delta_0^2(D(t-t_0))^{-3/2} + \varepsilon_0(D(t-t_0))^{-1/2}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

where $k_2 > 0$ does not depend on $t > t_0$ and $\varepsilon_0, \delta_0, D, t_0$. □

5 Proof of Theorem 3.1

5.1 Observation moments

We shall construct a sequence of time moments at each of which one can observe a certain number of sign changes for the state $r(\cdot,t)$ of the distributed relay operator $\mathcal{R}(w)$. We call these time moments *observation moments*. In this subsection, we shall obtain estimates for the u-component of the solution (u,v,w) of problem (2.5)–(2.7). They provide information about the amount of bacteria on certain parts of the interval $[\underline{x},\overline{x}]$. In the next subsection, we will use this information in order to estimate from below the number of sign changes for the state $r(\cdot,t) : [\underline{x},\overline{x}] \to \{-1,1\}$.

We set

$$U(x,t) = \int_x^{\overline{x}} u(y,t)\,dy. \tag{5.1}$$

[1] To prove the last inequality in (4.17), we use the following. Since, for any $\sigma > 0$, the function $x\exp(-\sigma x)$ achieves its maximum $\sigma^{-1}e^{-1}$ at $x = \sigma^{-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^2\exp(-n^2\sigma) &= \sum_{n=1}^{[\sigma^{-1/2}]} n^2\exp(-n^2\sigma) + \sum_{n=[\sigma^{-1/2}]+1}^{\infty} n^2\exp(-n^2\sigma) \\
&\le e^{-1}\sigma^{-3/2} + \int_{\sigma^{-1/2}}^{\infty} x^2\exp(-x^2\sigma)\,dx = \left(e^{-1} + \int_1^{\infty} y^2\exp(-y^2)\,dy\right)\sigma^{-3/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields the desired estimate for the first sum in (4.17). The estimate for the second sum in (4.17) follows from the inequality

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\exp(-n^2\sigma) \le \int_0^{\infty}\exp(-x^2\sigma)\,dx = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\sigma^{-1/2}.$$

Then

$$\underline{U}(t) = U(\underline{x}, t) = \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} u(y,t)\,dy;$$

cf. (2.4). The goal of this subsection is to prove the following result.

Lemma 5.1. *For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $D_* = D_*(N, v_0) > 0$, $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(N, v_0) > 0$, and positive sequences $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $\{\chi_i\}_{i=1}^N$, and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N+1}$ such that*

$$0 < \tau_N - \chi_N < \tau_N < \tau_{N-1} - \chi_{N-1} < \tau_{N-1} < \cdots < \tau_2 < \tau_1 - \chi_1 < \tau_1,$$
$$\underline{x} < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_{N+1} < \overline{x},$$

and

$$\frac{U(x_{i+1}, \tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau/D)} < \frac{1}{2}, \quad \tau \geq \tau_i - \chi_i. \tag{5.2}$$

$$2\frac{U(x_i, \tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau/D)} - 2\frac{U(x_{i+1}, \tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau/D)} - 1 > \chi_i, \quad \tau \in [\tau_i - \chi_i, \tau_i], \tag{5.3}$$

provided that $D \in (0, D_*)$ and $u_0(x)$ satisfies (3.1) with $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_*)$.

We begin with estimates similar to (5.2) and (5.3) for the function

$$\Phi(x,\tau) = \int_x^{\overline{x}} \varphi(y,\tau)\,dy. \tag{5.4}$$

Lemma 5.2. *There exist positive sequences $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, $\{\chi_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that $\tau_i, \chi_i \to 0$, $x_i \to \overline{x}$ as $i \to \infty$,*

$$\begin{gathered} 0 < \cdots < \tau_i - \chi_i < \tau_i < \tau_{i-1} - \chi_{i-1} < \tau_{i-1} < \cdots < \tau_2 < \tau_1 - \chi_1 < \tau_1, \\ \underline{x} < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_i < \cdots < \overline{x}, \end{gathered} \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$\Phi(x_{i+1}, \tau) < 1/2 - \chi_i \quad \text{for} \quad \tau \geq \tau_i - \chi_i, \tag{5.6}$$

$$2\Phi(x_i, \tau) - 2\Phi(x_{i+1}, \tau) - 1 > 2\chi_i \quad \text{for} \quad \tau \in [\tau_i - \chi_i, \tau_i]. \tag{5.7}$$

Proof. Note that

$$\Phi(x,\tau) \to 1 \quad \text{as} \quad \tau \to 0 \quad \forall x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x}); \tag{5.8}$$

$$\sup_{\tau \geq \hat{\tau}} \Phi(x,\tau) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad x \to \overline{x} \quad \forall \hat{\tau} > 0. \tag{5.9}$$

Indeed, set

$$\Psi(x,\tau) = \int_x^{\overline{x}} \psi(y,\tau)\,dy.$$

Then it is easy to see that $\Psi(x,\tau) \to 1$ as $\tau \to 0$ for any $x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x})$. Combining this with (5.4) and Lemma 4.1, we obtain (5.8). Relation (5.9) follows from (4.4) and (5.4).

Now we construct sequences $\{\tau_i\}$ and $\{x_i\}$ satisfying (5.5) and such that

$$\Phi(x_{i+1},\tau)<1/2\quad\forall\tau\geq\tau_i, \tag{5.10}$$

$$2\Phi(x_i,\tau_i)-2\Phi(x_{i+1},\tau_i)-1>0. \tag{5.11}$$

Take an arbitrary $x_1\in(\underline{x},\overline{x})$ and, using (5.8), choose $\tau_1>0$ such that

$$\Phi(x_1,\tau_1)>1/2.$$

This estimate and relation (5.9) ensure that inequality (5.11) with $i=1$ holds for any x_2 which is sufficiently close to $\overline{x}$. Simultaneously, relation (5.9) ensures (5.10) for such x_2. Hence, we can find $x_2\in(x_1,\overline{x})$ such that both (5.10) and (5.11) are satisfied for $i=1$. Now, using (5.8) again, we can choose a sufficiently small $\tau_2<\tau_1$ such that

$$\Phi(x_2,\tau_2)>1/2$$

and continue constructing the sequences $x_i\to\overline{x}-$, $\tau_i\to 0+$ by induction.

After the sequences $\{x_i\}$ and $\{\tau_i\}$ have been constructed, we choose a positive sequence χ_i such that (5.6) and (5.7) hold and $\tau_i<\tau_{i-1}-\chi_{i-1}$. □

In the next two lemmas, we show that $\dfrac{U(x,\tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau)}$ is close to $\Phi(x,\tau/D)$. Together with Lemma 5.2, this will complete the proof of Lemma 5.1.

We proceed in two steps. In the first step (Lemma 5.3), we show that one can choose $\tau_0>0$ not depending on D such that the density u at the time moment τ_0/D remains close to the delta function $\delta(x-\overline{x})$. In the second step (Lemma 5.4), using the exponential decay of the amount of nutrient $v(t)$, we choose D sufficiently small such that $v(t)$ at the moment τ_0/D is close to zero and show that, after this time moment, the density $u(x,t)$ can be approximated by the fundamental solution $\varphi(x,t)$.

Lemma 5.3. *For any $\varepsilon_1>0$, there is a sufficiently small $\theta_0=\theta_0(\varepsilon_1,v_0)>0$ with the following property. Given $\tau_0\leq\theta_0$, there exists $\varepsilon_*=\varepsilon_*(\tau_0,v_0)>0$ such that*

$$u(x,\tau_0/D)\leq\varepsilon_1\quad\text{for all } x\in[\underline{x},\overline{x}-\varepsilon_1],\ D>0, \tag{5.12}$$

provided that the initial data $u_0(x)$ satisfies (2.7) *and* (3.1) *with $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_*)$.*

Proof. Set

$$a(x,t)=\left(\frac{1}{2}+w(t)\mathcal{R}^x(w)(t)\right)v(t).$$

Then the component u of the solution (u,v,w) solves the linear problem

$$u_t=Du_{xx}+a(x,t)u,\quad u_x|_{x=\underline{x}}=u_x|_{x=\overline{x}}=0,\quad u|_{t=0}=u_0(x). \tag{5.13}$$

Combining the equality $|\mathcal{R}^x(x)(t)|=1$ with relations (2.9) and (2.10), we see that $0\leq a(x,t)\leq v_0e^{-\mu t}$. It follows from the comparison theorems that

$$\underline{u}(x,t)\leq u(x,t)\leq\overline{u}(x,t),\quad x\in[\underline{x},\overline{x}],\ t\geq 0, \tag{5.14}$$

where the lower and upper solutions $\underline{u}$ and $\overline{u}$ satisfy the equations

$$\underline{u}_t = D\underline{u}_{xx}, \qquad \overline{u}_t = D\overline{u}_{xx} + v_0 e^{-\mu t}\overline{u}, \tag{5.15}$$

respectively, with the same boundary and initial conditions as in (5.13).

By Lemma 4.2, for any $\tau_0 > 0$,

$$\|\underline{u}(\cdot, \tau_0/D) - \varphi(\cdot, \tau_0)\|_{C[\underline{x},\overline{x}]} \le \varepsilon_0, \tag{5.16}$$

where

$$\varepsilon_0 = C\left(\varepsilon^2 \tau_0^{-3/2} + \varepsilon \tau_0^{-1/2}\right) \tag{5.17}$$

and $C > 0$ does not depend on ε, τ_0, D. Using (5.14), (5.16), and the equality

$$\overline{u}(x,t) = \underline{u}(x,t) \exp\left(\frac{v_0(1-e^{-\mu t})}{\mu}\right), \tag{5.18}$$

we obtain

$$u(x, \tau_0/D) \le \exp\left(\frac{v_0}{\mu}\right)(\varphi(x,\tau_0) + \varepsilon_0), \quad x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x}]. \tag{5.19}$$

Using Lemma 4.1, it is easy to see that $\sup\limits_{x\in[\underline{x},\hat{x}]} \varphi(x,\tau) \to 0$ as $\tau \to 0$ for any $\hat{x} \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x})$. Therefore, for any $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, there is a sufficiently small $\theta_0 = \theta_0(\varepsilon_1, v_0) > 0$ such that

$$\exp\left(\frac{v_0}{\mu}\right)\varphi(x,\tau_0) \le \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} \quad \text{for } x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x} - \varepsilon_1],\ \tau_0 \le \theta_0. \tag{5.20}$$

Further, using (5.17), one can choose a sufficiently small $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(\tau_0, v_0)$ such that

$$\exp\left(\frac{v_0}{\mu}\right)\varepsilon_0 \le \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}, \tag{5.21}$$

provided that $\varepsilon \le \varepsilon_*$. Combining (5.19)–(5.21) yields (5.12). □

Lemma 5.4. *For any $N > 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, there are $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(N, v_0, \varepsilon_2) > 0$ and $D_* = D_*(N, v_0, \varepsilon_2) > 0$ such that*

$$\left\| \frac{U(\cdot, \tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau/D)} - \Phi(\cdot,\tau) \right\|_{C[\underline{x},\overline{x}]} \le \varepsilon_2 \quad \forall \tau \ge \tau_N - \chi_N,$$

where τ_N and χ_N are defined in Lemma 5.2, provided that $D \in (0, D_*)$ and the initial data $u_0(x)$ satisfies (2.7) *and* (3.1) *with $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_*)$.*

Proof. Take τ_0 in Lemma 5.3 such that $\tau_0 \le (\tau_N - \chi_N)/2$ and repeat the same line of argument as in the proof of Lemma 5.3, but now for the time interval $[\tau_0/D, \infty)$ to obtain

an analogue of estimates (5.19) for $t \geq (\tau_N - \chi_N)/D$. The lower and upper solutions $\underline{u}_*$ and $\overline{u}_*$ in the inequalities

$$\underline{u}_*(x,t) \leq u(x,t) \leq \overline{u}_*(x,t), \qquad x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x}],\ t \geq \tau_0/D, \tag{5.22}$$

are defined by the same problems (5.15) (with the Neumann boundary conditions), but with the initial conditions

$$\underline{u}_*|_{t=\tau_0/D} = \overline{u}_*|_{t=\tau_0/D} = u|_{t=\tau_0/D}.$$

In particular, this implies that

$$\overline{u}_*(x,t) = \underline{u}_*(x,t) \exp\left(v_0 \frac{e^{-\mu\tau_0/D} - e^{-\mu t}}{\mu}\right) \leq \underline{u}_*(x,t) \exp\left(\frac{v_0 e^{-\mu\tau_0/D}}{\mu}\right). \tag{5.23}$$

Again applying Lemma 4.2 and using the inequalities $\dot{\underline{U}}(t) \geq 0$ and $\tau_0 \leq (\tau_N - \chi_N)/2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{\underline{u}_*(\cdot, \tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau_0/D)} - \varphi(\cdot, \tau - \tau_0) \right\|_{C[\underline{x},\overline{x}]} \\ &\qquad \leq C_0 \left(\varepsilon_1^2 (\tau_N - \chi_N)^{-3/2} + \varepsilon_1 (\tau_N - \chi_N)^{-1/2}\right) \leq C_1 \varepsilon_1 \end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

for all $\tau \geq \tau_N - \chi_N$, where $C_0, C_1 > 0$ do not depend on $\tau, \tau_0, D, \varepsilon, \varepsilon_1$ (but C_1 depends on N).

Next, we take $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\varepsilon_1)$ such that the inequality

$$\|\varphi(\cdot, \tau - \tau_0) - \varphi(\cdot, \tau)\|_{C[\underline{x},\overline{x}]} \leq C_1 \varepsilon_1 \quad \forall \tau \geq \tau_N - \chi_N \tag{5.25}$$

holds along with the inequality $\tau_0 \leq (\tau_N - \chi_N)/2$. Then (5.24) and (5.25) imply

$$\left\| \frac{\underline{u}_*(\cdot, \tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau_0/D)} - \varphi(\cdot, \tau) \right\|_{C[\underline{x},\overline{x}]} \leq 2C_1 \varepsilon_1 \quad \forall \tau \geq \tau_N - \chi_N.$$

Using the last inequality and estimates (5.22) and (5.23), we have

$$\varphi(x,\tau) - 2C_1\varepsilon_1 \leq \frac{u(x,\tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau_0/D)} \leq \exp\left(\frac{v_0 e^{-\mu\tau_0/D}}{\mu}\right)(\varphi(x,\tau) + 2C_1\varepsilon_1)$$

for all $x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x}]$, $\tau \geq \tau_N - \chi_N$. Integrating with respect to x yields

$$\Phi(x,\tau) - 2C_1\varepsilon_1 \leq \frac{U(x,\tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau_0/D)} \leq \exp\left(\frac{v_0 e^{-\mu\tau_0/D}}{\mu}\right)(\Phi(x,\tau) + 2C_1\varepsilon_1) \tag{5.26}$$

for all $x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x}]$, $\tau \geq \tau_N - \chi_N$.

Since $e^{-\mu\tau_0/D} \to 0$, $\underline{U}(\tau/D) \to 1 + v_0$ as $D \to 0$ uniformly with respect to $\tau \geq \tau_0$, and $|\Phi(x,\tau)| \leq 1$, it follow that there is $D_* = D_*(\tau_0, v_0, \varepsilon_1)$ such that

$$\Phi(x,\tau) - 3C_1\varepsilon_1 \leq \frac{U(x,\tau/D)}{\underline{U}(\tau/D)} \leq \Phi(x,\tau) + 3C_1\varepsilon_1,$$

provided that $D \leq D_*$. Setting $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2/(3C_1)$, we complete the proof. □

Now Lemma 5.1 follows from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.4.

5.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

5.2.1 Terminology

For the rest of the proof of the theorem we adopt the following terminology. Points of the interval $\underline{x} < x \le \overline{x}$ are colored in *white* (the relay is in state -1) and *black* (the relay is in state 1). Coloring evolves in time. A point $\bar{x}_j = \bar{x}_j(t)$ which separates an interval of white from an interval of black will be called a *front*; cf. (2.3). The total number of fronts can vary, but, by Theorem 2.1, remains finite at all times (equivalently, the state of the distributed relay operator remains simple at all times). A front can either stay (a *steady* front) or move right. That is, any $\bar{x}_j(t)$ is a non-decreasing function on the time interval of its existence. A front disappears if it hits another front or is hit by another front. A front is called *immortal* if it cannot disappear.

The definition of relays implies the following dynamics of fronts (equivalently, dynamics of the state $r = r(x,t)$ of the distributed relay operator $\mathcal{R}$) in response to variations of the input w. If at some moment t the fronts create a partition $\underline{x} < \bar{x}_1(t) < \cdots < \bar{x}_{\bar{N}(t)-1} < \bar{x}_{\bar{N}(t)} = \overline{x}$ of the segment $[\underline{x}, \overline{x}]$ into alternating black and white intervals, then, necessarily, $|w(t)| \le \bar{x}_1(t)$. The fronts $\bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_{\bar{N}(t)}$ cannot move, they are steady; the most left front $\bar{x}_1(t)$ can move only if $|w(t)| = \bar{x}_1(t)$, otherwise (i.e., if $|w(t)| < \bar{x}_1(t)$) it is also steady. When the front $\bar{x}_1(t)$ hits the front $\bar{x}_2(t)$, these two fronts disappear. A new front is born when the input $w(t)$ leaves the interval $[-\underline{x}, \underline{x}]$ for the first time, and then each time the input leaves this interval after having entered it from the other end.

5.2.2 Collision moments

An important moment for our consideration is when the front $\bar{x}_1$ hits the front $\bar{x}_2$. At such a collision moment t the fronts $\bar{x}_1$ and $\bar{x}_2$ disappear and the front $\bar{x}_3(t-)$ becomes the most left front, i.e., $\bar{x}_1(t+) = \bar{x}_3(t-)$.

Lemma 5.5. *Assume that the front $\bar{x}_1$ hits the front $\bar{x}_2$ at a moment t. Then*

$$\frac{U(\bar{x}_1(t+), t)}{\underline{U}(t)} \ge \frac{1}{2}. \tag{5.27}$$

Proof. Note that $w(t)$ and $\dot{w}(t)$ are continuous (see Sec. 2.3) and, at the collision moment t, $w(t)\dot{w}(t) \ge 0$. Substituting the right-hand side of the last equation of system (2.5) into this relation and taking into account that $1/2 \pm w(t) \ge \mu > 0$ at all times, we obtain

$$0 \ge w(t)\mathcal{P}(u,w)(t) = w(t) \int_{\underline{x}}^{\overline{x}} u(x,t)\mathcal{R}^x(w)(t)\, dx. \tag{5.28}$$

Further, for s slightly less than the collision moment t, the intervals $(\underline{x}, \bar{x}_1(s))$ and $(\bar{x}_2(s), \bar{x}_3(s))$ had the same color:

$$\mathcal{R}^x(w)(s) = \operatorname{sign} w(s), \quad x \in (\underline{x}, \bar{x}_1(s)) \cup (\bar{x}_2(s), \bar{x}_3(s)),$$

while the interval $(\bar{x}_1(s), \bar{x}_2(s))$ had the opposite color:

$$\mathcal{R}^x(w)(s) = -\operatorname{sign} w(s), \quad x \in (\bar{x}_1(s), \bar{x}_2(s)).$$

At the collision moment t, the front $\bar{x}_3(t-)$ becomes the most left front. Hence, we renumber the fronts. In particular, we have $\bar{x}_1(t+) = \bar{x}_3(t-)$, and now the whole interval $(\underline{x}, \bar{x}_1(t+))$ has the same color:

$$\mathcal{R}^x(w)(t) = \operatorname{sign} w(t), \quad x \in (\underline{x}, \bar{x}_1(t+)).$$

Combining this with (5.28), we obtain

$$0 \geq \int_{\underline{x}}^{\bar{x}_1(t+)} u(x,t)\,dx + \operatorname{sign} w(t) \int_{\bar{x}_1(t+)}^{\overline{x}} u(x,t)\mathcal{R}^x(w)(t)\,dx,$$

where the first integral equals $\underline{U}(t) - U(\bar{x}_1(t+), t)$ and the absolute value of the second integral does not exceed $U(\bar{x}_1(t+), t)$. That is, at the collision moment, inequality (5.27) must hold. □

5.2.3 Completion of the proof of Theorem 3.1

Fix an arbitrary $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then fix $D_* = D_*(N, v_0) > 0$, $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(N, v_0) > 0$, and the sequences $\{\tau_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $\{\chi_i\}_{i=1}^N$, and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^{N+1}$ as indicated in Lemma 5.1. Then relations (5.2) and (5.3) hold for all $D \in (0, D_*)$ and $u_0(x)$ satisfying (3.1) with $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_*)$.

Now we will complete the proof by induction with respect to $i = N+1, N, \ldots, 1$. Set $\tau_{N+1} = 0$ and $t_{N+1} = 0$.

Basis. The system has at least 0 immortal fronts in the interval $[x_{N+1}, \overline{x})$ at the moment $t_{N+1} = 0$. This statement is obviously true.

Inductive step: "$N - i \;\Rightarrow\; N - i + 1$" *for* $1 \leq i \leq N$. We assume that the system has at least $N - i$ immortal fronts in the interval $[x_{i+1}, \overline{x})$ at the moment $t_{i+1} = \tau_{i+1}/D$. Let us prove that it will have at least $N - i + 1$ immortal fronts in the interval $[x_i, \overline{x})$ after the moment $t_i = \tau_i/D$; see Fig. 5.1.

First, we note that each front belonging to the interval $[x_{i+1}, \overline{x})$ at the moment $\theta_i = (\tau_i - \chi_i)/D$ is immortal after this moment. Indeed, assuming the opposite, a collision of two fronts occurs at some point of the interval $[x_{i+1}, \overline{x}]$ at a moment $t \geq \theta_i$. Therefore, by Lemma 5.5, inequality (5.27) should be valid for a point $\bar{x}_1(t+) \in [x_{i+1}, \overline{x}]$ at the moment t. However, (5.27) contradicts (5.2) as U decreases in x.

Now two cases are possible.

In the first case, the interval $[x_i, x_{i+1})$ contains at least one front at the moment $\theta_i = (\tau_i - \chi_i)/D$. Consider the most right front F in this interval. We claim that the front F is immortal. Indeed, F cannot hit a front located to the right of it because all the fronts to the right belong to $[x_{i+1}, \overline{x})$ and are immortal by the above argument. Suppose, at some moment $t \geq \theta_i$, the front F is hit by another front from the left. Then, at the collision moment, we have $\bar{x}_1(t+) \geq x_{i+1}$ again. Hence, by Lemma 5.5, inequality (5.27) should be valid. However, (5.27) contradicts (5.2) because U decreases in x.



Figure 5.1: Spatial profiles of $u(x,t)/\underline{U}(t)$ and $\mathcal{R}^x(w)(t)$ at the moment $t = \theta_i = (\tau_i - \chi_i)/D$, which precedes $t_i = \tau_i/D$. The picture corresponds to the second case in the inductive step: the most left front is not in the interval $[x_i, x_{i+1})$, but, having a positive velocity, will enter $[x_i, x_{i+1})$ within the time interval $t \in (\theta_i, t_i)$ and become immortal.

In the second case, the interval $[x_i, x_{i+1})$ contains no fronts at the moment $\theta_i = (\tau_i - \chi_i)/D$. Hence, all the points of this interval are of the same color. To be specific, assume without loss of generality that this interval is white:

$$\mathcal{R}^x(w)(\theta_i) = -1, \quad x \in [x_i, x_{i+1}).$$

Hence, $w(\theta_i) < x_i$. Denote by t_* the first moment when $w(t) = x_i$ after the moment θ_i, and set $t_* = \infty$ if $w(t)$ never reaches x_i.

We claim that $t_* < t_i$. Indeed, during the time interval $\theta_i \leq t < t_*$, the interval $[x_i, x_{i+1})$ remains white. Hence, using the last equation of system (2.5), we obtain for $\theta_i \leq t < \min\{t_*, t_i\}$

$$\dot{w} = f(w) \left(\int_{x_i}^{x_{i+1}} u(x,t)\, dx - \int_{\underline{x}}^{x_i} u(x,t) \mathcal{R}^x(w)\, dx - \int_{x_{i+1}}^{\overline{x}} u(x,t) \mathcal{R}^x(w)\, dx \right),$$

where $f(w) = (1/2 + w)(1/2 - w)$. In this equation, the first integral equals $U(x_i,t) - U(x_{i+1},t)$, while the sum of the absolute values of the other two integrals does not exceed $\underline{U}(t) - U(x_i,t) + U(x_{i+1},t)$ (as $|\mathcal{R}^x(w)| = 1$). Therefore,

$$\dot{w}(t) \geq f(w)(2U(x_i,t) - 2U(x_{i+1},t) - \underline{U}(t)), \quad \theta_i \leq t \leq \min\{t_*, t_i\}. \tag{5.29}$$

Since estimate (5.3) holds for all $t \geq \theta_i$, $f(w) \geq \mu^2$, and $\underline{U}(t) \geq 1$, it follows from (5.29) that

$$\dot{w}(t) \geq \chi_i \mu^2, \quad \theta_i \leq t \leq \min\{t_*, t_i\}. \tag{5.30}$$

If $t_i \leq t_*$, then inequality (5.30) implies

$$1 \geq w(t_i) - w(\theta_i) \geq \chi_i \mu^2 (t_i - \theta_i) = \chi_i^2 \mu^2 / D,$$

where we have used the uniform estimate $|w| \leq 1/2$. Hence, decreasing D_* if necessary, we obtain the contradiction. Therefore, $\theta_i < t_* < t_i$. By definition of t_*, a front enters the interval $[x_i, x_{i+1})$ from the lower end at the moment t_*. It is immortal by the same argument as in the first case.

In both cases, we have proved that there will be at least $N - i + 1$ immortal fronts in the interval $[x_i, \overline{x})$ after the moment t_* and hence after t_i. □

6 Proof of Theorem 3.2

The proof is a modification of the above proof of Theorem 3.1.

6.1 Observation moments

The goal of this subsection is to prove an analogue of Lemma 5.1, but keeping the observation moments of order 1 instead of D^{-1} as $D \to 0$. Furthermore, the distances between the immortal fronts will be of order $D^{1/2}$ instead of 1.

The main reason of the time scale $O(D^{-1/2})$ in Lemma 5.1 was the necessity to wait long enough (namely, up to the time moment τ_0/D) until the amount of nutrient $v(t)$ becomes small enough. This is not necessary in the proof of Theorem 3.2 because we assume v_0 small from the very beginning.

As before, we set $\mu = 1/2 - \overline{x}$.

Lemma 6.1. *Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there are $D_* = D_*(N) > 0$, $v_* = v_*(N) > 0$, and sequences $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^N$, and $\{y_i\}_{i=0}^N$ such that*

$$\begin{gathered} 0 < \theta_1 < t_1 < \theta_2 < t_2 < \cdots < \theta_N < t_N, \\ 0 = y_0 < y_1 < y_2 < \cdots < y_N, \end{gathered} \tag{6.1}$$

and the following is true. For any $D \in (0, D_*)$, one can find $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(D) > 0$ such that

$$\frac{U(x_{i-1}, t)}{\underline{U}(t)} < \frac{1}{2}, \quad t \geq \theta_i, \tag{6.2}$$

$$2\frac{U(x_i, t)}{\underline{U}(t)} - 2\frac{U(x_{i-1}, t)}{\underline{U}(t)} - 1 > \frac{1}{\mu^2 (t_i - \theta_i)}, \quad t \in [\theta_i, t_i], \tag{6.3}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, N$, where $x_i = \overline{x} - D^{1/2} y_i$, provided that $u_0(x)$ satisfies (3.1) with $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_*)$ and $v_0 \in [0, v_*)$.

We begin with estimates similar to (6.2) and (6.3) for the function Φ given by (5.4).

Lemma 6.2. *Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then there exist $D_* = D_*(N) > 0$ and sequences $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^N$, and $\{y_i\}_{i=0}^N$ satisfying* (6.1) *and such that*

$$\Phi(x_{i-1}, Dt) < \frac{1}{2}, \quad t \geq \theta_i, \tag{6.4}$$

$$2\Phi(x_i, Dt) - 2\Phi(x_{i-1}, Dt) - 1 > \frac{1}{\mu^2(t_i - \theta_i)}, \quad t \in [\theta_i, t_i], \tag{6.5}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N$, where $x_i = \overline{x} - D^{1/2} y_i$, provided that $D \in (0, D_*)$.

Proof. Let $E(y)$ be the error function

$$E(y) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^y \exp\left(-z^2\right)\, dz. \tag{6.6}$$

Then

$$\Psi(x, \tau) = \int_x^{\overline{x}} \psi(y, \tau)\, dy = E\left(\frac{\bar{x} - x}{2\sqrt{\tau}}\right). \tag{6.7}$$

For $i = 1, 2, \dots$, we consider an increasing sequence of time moments t_i, an (auxiliary) increasing sequence of times θ_i, and an increasing sequence y_i such that $t_{i-1} < \theta_i < t_i$ and

$$E\left(\frac{y_{i-1}}{2\sqrt{t}}\right) < 1/2, \quad t \geq \theta_i; \tag{6.8}$$

$$2E\left(\frac{y_i}{2\sqrt{t_i}}\right) - 2E\left(\frac{y_{i-1}}{2\sqrt{\theta_i}}\right) - 1 > \frac{1}{\mu^2(t_i - \theta_i)}, \tag{6.9}$$

where $t_0 = 0$ and $y_0 = 0$. Such sequences can always be constructed step by step. For example, at the ith step, we can first fix a sufficiently large θ_i to satisfy (6.8); then take a sufficiently large $t_i > \theta_i$ to have

$$2 - 2E\left(\frac{y_{i-1}}{2\sqrt{\theta_i}}\right) - 1 > \frac{1}{\mu^2(t_i - \theta_i)}; \tag{6.10}$$

and then, using $E(\infty) = 1$ and (6.10), choose a sufficiently large y_i to ensure (6.9). Since E is an increasing function, relation (6.9) implies

$$2E\left(\frac{y_i}{2\sqrt{t}}\right) - 2E\left(\frac{y_{i-1}}{2\sqrt{t}}\right) - 1 > \frac{1}{\mu^2(t_i - \theta_i)}, \quad t \in [\theta_i, t_i], \tag{6.11}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \dots$.

Now fix $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Using the relations $\overline{x} - x_i = D^{1/2} y_i$, the equality (6.7), and Lemma 4.1 for a specific $\theta = 1$, we have

$$\left|\Phi(x_i, Dt) - E\left(\frac{y_i}{2\sqrt{t}}\right)\right| \leq c_1 \exp\left(-\frac{(\overline{x} - \underline{x})^2}{5Dt}\right), \qquad i = 1, \dots, N;\ t \in (0, t_N], \tag{6.12}$$

where $c_1 > 0$ does not depend on D, provided that $D \in (0, D_*)$ and $D_* t_N \in (0, 1]$.

Due to (6.12), by choosing D_* small enough, we can make the value $\left|\Phi(x_i, Dt) - E\left(\frac{y_i}{2\sqrt{t}}\right)\right|$ arbitrarily small for all $i = 1, \dots, N$, $t \in (0, t_N]$, and $D \in (0, D_*)$. Hence, using (6.8) and (6.11) and the triangle inequality, we obtain inequalities (6.4) and (6.5). □

Lemma 6.3. *Let D_* be the constant from Lemma 6.2. Then, for any $D \in (0, D_*)$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, there are $\varepsilon_* = \varepsilon_*(\varepsilon_2, D) > 0$ and $v_* = v_*(\varepsilon_2)$ such that*

$$\left\| \frac{U(\cdot, t)}{\underline{U}(t)} - \Phi(\cdot, Dt) \right\|_{C[\underline{x}, \overline{x}]} \le \varepsilon_2 \quad \forall t \ge \theta_1,$$

provided that $u_0(x)$ satisfies (3.1) with $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_*)$ and $v_0 \in [0, v_*)$.

Proof. In the proof of Lemma 5.3 (see (5.14) and (5.18)), we have shown that

$$\int_x^{\overline{x}} \underline{u}(y, t)\, dy \le U(x, t) \le \exp\left(\frac{v_0}{\mu}\right) \int_x^{\overline{x}} \underline{u}(y, t)\, dy, \quad x \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x}],\ t \ge 0, \tag{6.13}$$

where $\underline{u}$ solves

$$\underline{u}_t = D\underline{u}_{xx}, \quad \underline{u}_x|_{x=\overline{x}} = \underline{u}_x|_{x=\underline{x}} = 0, \quad \underline{u}|_{t=0} = u_0(x).$$

On the other hand, Lemma 4.2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\underline{u}(\cdot, t) - \varphi(\cdot, Dt)\|_{C[\underline{x}, \overline{x}]} \\ &\qquad \le C\left(\varepsilon^2 (D\theta_1)^{-3/2} + \varepsilon (D\theta_1)^{-1/2}\right), \quad t \ge \theta_1, \end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

where θ_1 is defined in Lemma 6.2 and $C > 0$ does not depend on $t, \varepsilon, D, \theta_1$.

Now fix D and an arbitrary $\varepsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$. Choose $v_* = v_*(\varepsilon_1)$ such that

$$\exp\left(\frac{v_0}{\mu}\right) \le 1 + \varepsilon_1, \quad 1 - \varepsilon_1 \le \frac{1}{\underline{U}(t)} \le 1 \tag{6.15}$$

for all $v_0 \in [0, v_*)$, where we use that $1 = \underline{U}(0) \le \underline{U}(t) \le \underline{U}(0) + v(0) = 1 + v_0$. Next choose ε_* such that

$$\varepsilon^2 (D\theta_1)^{-3/2} + \varepsilon (D\theta_1)^{-1/2} \le \varepsilon_1 \tag{6.16}$$

for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_*)$.

Combining (6.13)–(6.16) and using the fact that $|\Phi(x, t)| \le 1$ yields

$$\left\| \frac{U(\cdot, t)}{\underline{U}(t)} - \Phi(\cdot, Dt) \right\|_{C[\underline{x}, \overline{x}]} \le c_1 \varepsilon_1 \quad \forall t \ge \theta_1,$$

where c_1 does not depend on the other quantities in the inequality. Setting $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 / c_1$, we complete the proof. □

Now Lemma 6.1 follows from Lemmas 6.2 and 6.3.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Relations (6.2) and (6.3) are counterparts of equations (5.2) and (5.3), respectively. The proof can be now completed by exactly the same argument as we used in Sec. 5.2. It suffices to use estimates (6.2) and (6.3) in place of (5.2) and (5.3).

In particular, relation (6.2) ensures that every front belonging to the interval $[x_{i-1}, \overline{x})$ at the moment $t = \theta_i$ is immortal and that if the interval $[x_i, x_{i-1})$ contains at least one front at the moment $t = \theta_i$, then the most right of these fronts is immortal.

Relation (6.3) ensures that if the interval $[x_i, x_{i-1})$ does not contain fronts at the moment $t = \theta_i$, then at least one immortal front arrives at this interval at a moment t_* preceding t_i, because during the time interval $\theta_i \le t \le \min\{t_*, t_i\}$, we have

$$\dot{w}(t) \ge \mu^2 \underline{U}(t) \left(2\frac{U(x_i, Dt)}{\underline{U}(t)} - 2\frac{U(x_{i-1}, Dt)}{\underline{U}(t)} - 1 \right) > \frac{1}{t_i - \theta_i}.$$

Remark 6.1. We have also obtained asymptotic formulas (as the initial amount of nutrient v_0 and the diffusion coefficient D tend to zero, while the initial density $u_0(x)$ tends to the delta function) for positions of a few first steady immortal fronts and the time moments at which these fronts appear.

Let us consider the formation of fronts on a fixed time interval $[0, T)$, assuming that:

1. The initial density $u_0(x)$ satisfies (3.1) with $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(D) > 0$, where $\varepsilon(D) \to 0$ as $D \to 0$.
2. The initial amount of food is small: $v_0 = v_0(D) > 0$, where $v_0(D) \to 0$ as $D \to 0$.
3. The initial value of the input is close to $\overline{x}$: $w_0 = w_0(D) \le \overline{x}$, where $w_0(D) \to \overline{x}$ as $D \to 0$.
4. The initial configuration is $r_0(x) \equiv 1$.

Under these assumptions, we denote by $t_1 < t_2 < \cdots$ the consecutive time moments at which the moving fronts become steady and immortal; their positions at these moments are denoted $x_1 > x_2 > \cdots$ (where $x_i \in [\underline{x}, \overline{x}]$ for all i). We have obtained the formulas

$$t_n = s_n + o(1); \qquad x_n = \overline{x} - q_n, \quad \text{where} \quad q_n = 2\big(y_n + o(1)\big)\big(Ds_n\big)^{1/2}$$

for the first six fronts; here $o(1)$ stands for functions of D that tend to 0 as $D \to 0$ (the convergence of $o(1)$ to zero may depend on T, but not on n). If, for example, $\overline{x} = 1/4$, then the values of s_n, y_n in these formulas (which, in fact, do not depend on $\underline{x}$) are equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &(s_1, y_1) \approx (2.2,\ 0.48), \quad (s_2, y_2) \approx (9.1,\ 0.83), \quad (s_3, y_3) \approx (24.0,\ 1.07), \\ &(s_4, y_4) \approx (53.3,\ 1.26), \quad (s_5, y_5) \approx (108.4,\ 1.42), \quad (s_6, y_6) \approx (209.4,\ 1.57), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &q_1 \approx 1.4\, D^{1/2}, \quad q_2 \approx 5.0\, D^{1/2}, \quad q_3 \approx 10.5\, D^{1/2}, \\ &q_4 \approx 18.4\, D^{1/2}, \quad q_5 \approx 29.6\, D^{1/2}, \quad q_6 \approx 45.4\, D^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The authors do not know asymptotics of further fronts; this is a subject of future work.

Acknowledgments

PG acknowledges the support of Collaborative Research Center 910 (Germany). DR was supported by NSF grant DMS-1413223. The authors are grateful to Sergey Tikhomirov who created a software for a number of numerical experiments.

References

[1] Applebe B, Flynn D, McNamara H, O'Kane P, Pimenov A, Pokrovskii A, Rachinskii D, Zhezherun A (2009) Rate-independent hysteresis in terrestrial hydrology. IEEE Control Systems Magazine 29 (1): 44-69.

[2] Appelbe B, Rachinskii D, Zhezherun A (2008) Hopf bifurcation in a van der Pol type oscillator with magnetic hysteresis. Physica B 403 (2-3): 301-304.

[3] Benzer S (1953) Induced synthesis of enzymes in bacteria analyzed at the cellular level. Biochim et Biophys Acta 11: 383-395.

[4] Brokate M, Pokrovskii AV, Rachinskii DI (2006) Asymptotic stability of continual sets of periodic solutions to systems with hysteresis. J Math Anal Appl 319: 94-109.

[5] Brokate M, Pokrovskii AV, Rachinskii DI, Rasskazov O (2005) Differential equations with hysteresis via a canonical example. In: The Science of Hysteresis. Mayergoyz ID, Bertotti G, editor., Elsevier. Vol. I, Chapter II: 125-291.

[6] Cohn M, Horibata K (1959) Inhibition by glucose of the induced synthesis of the beta-galactoside-enzyme system of Escherichia coli. Analysis of maintenance. J Bacteriol 78: 601-612.

[7] Cohn M, Horibata K (1959) Analysis of the differentiation and of the heterogeneity within a population of Eschericia coli undergoing induced beta- galactosidase synthesis. J Bacteriol 78: 613-623.

[8] Cohn M, Horibata K (1959) Physiology of the inhibition by glucose of the induced synthesis of the beta-galactoside-enzyme system of Escherichia coli. J Bacteriol 78: 624-635.

[9] Cross R, McNamara H, Pokrovskii A, Rachinskii D (2008) A new paradigm for modelling hysteresis in macroeconomic flows. Physica B 403 (2-3): 231-236.

[10] Delbrück M (1949) Translation of discussion following a paper by Sonneborn TM and Beale GH. In: Unité Biologiques Douées de Continuité Génétique. Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris: 33-35.

[11] Diamond P, Kuznetsov NA, Rachinskii DI (2001) On the Hopf bifurcation in control systems with asymptotically homogeneous at infinity bounded nonlinearities. J Differential Equations 175: 1-26.

[12] Diamond P, Rachinskii DI, Yumagulov MG (2000) Stability of large cycles in a nonsmooth problem with Hopf bifurcation at infinity. Nonlinear Anal 42(6): 1017-1031.

[13] Dubnau D, Losick R (2006) Bistability in bacteria. Mol Microbiol 61: 564-572.

[14] Friedman G, Gurevich P, McCarthy S, Rachinskii D (2014) Switching behaviour of two-phenotype bacteria in varying environment. J Phys Conf Ser, accepted.

[15] Friedman G, Rachinskii D (2014) Hysteresis can grant fitness in stochastically varying environment. PLoS ONE 9(7): e103241.

[16] Gardner TS, Cantor CR, Collins JJ (2000) Construction of a genetic toggle switch in Escherichia coli. Nature 403: 339-342.

[17] Graziani S, Silar P, Daboussi M-J (2004) Bistability and hysteresis of the 'Secteur' differentiation are controlled by a two-gene locus in Nectria haematococca. BMC Biology 2 (18): 1-19.

[18] Gurevich P, Rachinskii D (2013) Well-posedness of parabolic equations containing hysteresis with diffusive thresholds. Proc Steklov Inst Math 283: 87-109.

[19] Gurevich PL, Tikhomirov SB (2014) Systems of reaction-diffusion equations with spatially distributed hysteresis. Mathematica Bohemica (Proc Equadiff 2013), accepted.

[20] Ham TS, Lee SK, Keasling JD, Arkin AP (2008) Design and construction of a double inversion recombination switch for heritable sequential genetic memory. PLoS ONE 3 (7): e2815.

[21] Hoppensteadt FC, Jäger W (1980) Pattern formation by bacteria. Lecture Notes in Biomathematics 38: 68-81.

[22] Kopfova J (2006) Hysteresis in biological models. J Phys Conf Ser 55: 130-134.

[23] Krasnosel'skii AM, Rachinskii DI (2001) On continua of cycles in systems with hysteresis. Doklady Math 63 (3): 339-344.

[24] Krasnosel'skii AM, Rachinskii DI (2002) On a bifurcation governed by hysteresis nonlinearity. NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl 9: 93-115.

[25] Krejci P, O'Kane P, Pokrovskii A, Rachinskii D (2011) Stability results for a soil model with singular hysteretic hydrology. J Phys Conf Ser 268: 012016.

[26] Kussell E, Lieber S, Phenotypic diversity, population growth, and information in fluctuating environments. Science 309: 2075-2078.

[27] Lai K, Robertson MJ, Schaffer DV (2004) The sonic hedgehog signaling system as a bistable genetic switch. Biophys J 86: 2748-2757.

[28] (2005) The Science of Hysteresis. Mayergoyz ID, Bertotti G, editors. Elsevier. 751 p.

[29] Maamar H, Raj A, Dubnau D (2007) Noise in gene expression determines cell fate in Bacillus subtilis. Science 317: 526-529.

[30] Monod J (1966) From enzymatic adaptation to allosteric transitions. Science 154: 475-483.

[31] Novick A, Weiner M (1957) Enzyme induction as an all-or-none phenomenon. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 43 (7): 553-566.

[32] Ozbudak EM, Thattai M, Lim HN, Shraiman BI, van Oudenaarden A (2004) Multistability in the lactose utilization network of Escherichia coli. Nature 427: 737-740.

[33] Pomerening JR, Sontag ED, Ferrell JE Jr (2003) Building a cell cycle oscillator: hysteresis and bistability in the activation of Cdc2. Nature Cell Biol 5: 346-351.

[34] Smits WK, Kuipers OP, Veening JW (2006) Phenotypic variation in bacteria: the role of feedback regulation. Nat Rev Microbiol 4: 259-271.

[35] Spiegelman S, DeLorenzo WF (1952) Substrate stabilization of enzymeforming capacity during the segregation of a heterozygote. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 38 (7): 583-592.

[36] Thattai M, van Oudenaarden A (2004) Stochastic gene expression in fluctuating environments. Genetics 167: 523-530.

[37] Thattai M, Shraiman B (2003) Metabolic switching in the sugar phosphotransferase system of Escherichia coli. Biophys J 85: 744-754.

[38] Visintin A (1986) Evolution problems with hysteresis in the source term. SIAM J Math Anal 17: 1113-1138.

[39] Wanga L, Walkera BL, Iannacconeb S, Bhatta D, Kennedya PJ, Tse WT (2009) Bistable switches control memory and plasticity in cellular differentiation. PNAS U S A 106 (16): 6638-6643.

[40] Winge Ö, Roberts C (1948) Inheritance of enzymatic characters in yeast and the phenomenon of long term adaptation. Comp rend trav Lab, Carlsberg. Ser physiol 24: 263-315.

[41] Wolf DM, Arkin AP (2003) Motifs, modules and games in bacteria. Curr Opin Microbiol: 125-134.

[42] Wolf DM, Fontaine-Bodin L, Bischofs I, Price G, Keasling J, Arkin AP (2008) Memory in microbes: quantifying history-dependent behaviour in a bacterium. PLoS ONE 3 (2): e1700.

[43] Wolf DM, Vazirani VJ, Arkin AP (2005) Diversity in times of adversity: probabilistic strategies in microbial survival games. J Theor Biol 234 (2): 227-253.